



# NMCI Deployables Support Concept Evaluation Strategy DRAFT



Capt Patrick  
McGuire

mcguirepf@mcsc.usmc.mil  
DSN 278-0791

09/12/16



# Outline

- Assumptions
- Proposed Evaluation Strategy
- Roles & Responsibilities
- Resource Requirements



# Assumptions

- Strategy based on 01 Feb 03 first AOR date for Marine Corps
- **USMC will not order any deployable seats until a limited operational test conducted by MCOTEA provides favorable results**  
(this is based on previous Gen Shea direction to Rich Glover; still valid?)
- ISF buy-in & support in evaluation process
  - In best interests of ISF and DON to make deployables work; their involvement in process will enhance chances for success
  - Will propose that they help DON bear the cost of this evaluation; assist in quickly resolving any issues



# Rationale for Evaluation Strategy

- Involve operational units, other stakeholders in process early to ensure evaluation addresses deployables requirements
- Identify & resolve as many issues as possible through lab evaluation
  - This will increase capabilities for operational unit evaluation & likelihood of successful outcome



# Proposed Evaluation Strategy

- Phase I: Conduct Lab Evaluation (MCTSSA/Commercial)
    - Develop comprehensive Deployables Evaluation Plan (MCOTEA, MCTSSA, MITNOC, PM NMCI, Depl WG)
    - Test deployable seats in lab w/ available USMC GCE, ACE & CSSE tactical applications
- Test:
- 1) Application compatibility
  - 2) Email forwarding & redirection
  - 3) Help desk support
  - 4) Reachback [PARTIAL]
  - 5) Data migration [PARTIAL]
  - 6) Deployment Process Architecture



# Proposed Evaluation Strategy

- Phase II: Conduct USMC Operational Unit Evaluation
  - USMC given responsibility in NMCI Test & Evaluation Strategy Plan (TESP) for full OT&E of Deployables
  - **C4 will identify & coordinate use of operating force exercise to conduct OT&E**
  - MCOTEA to develop test plan & execute OT&E
- Necessity of full OT&E on deployables following any pre-transition operational unit deployables evaluation by Navy & USMC should be reviewed at a future date



# Proposed Evaluation Strategy

- Phase II: Conduct USMC Operational Unit Evaluation
  - Alternative A: Pre-Transition Operational Exercise
    - **C4 selects short term, CONUS exercise from MCTEEP (CAX, backyard exercise, etc)**
    - Supply unit with NMCI deployable seats (at least 30; considered statistically significant)
    - Monitor and record performance of deployable seats & document all issues



# Alternative A: Pre-Transition Operational Exercise

- Pros
  - Will provide critical feedback on deployables 6+ months earlier than post-transition test
  - Reduced scale of evaluation (# seats used, length of exercise) vs OT&E; lower cost
- Cons
  - Cannot fully test deployables concept before USMC site cutover to NMCI (reachback/app conn, etc)
  - May still have to complete OT&E on deployables





# Proposed Evaluation Strategy

- Phase II: Conduct USMC Operational Unit Evaluation
  - Alternative B: Following USMC Site Transition
    - Use deployable seats at Cmd like MARFORLANT, or possibly Reserve Sqdn at NAF Washington
    - Conduct deployables evaluation to fullest extent possible using unit deployment/exercise
    - Prepare OT&E report & submit to AC/S C4



# Alternative B: Post-Transition Operational Exercise

- Pros
  - Can test greater scope of deployables processes
  - More time available for NMCI issues to be resolved
- Cons
  - Will not be able to conduct test before Mar/Apr 03 (based on AOR date listed in assumptions)



# Proposed Evaluation Strategy

- Phase II: Conduct USMC Operational Unit Evaluation
  - Alternative C: Perform both pre- & post-transition operational evaluations
    - Conduct limited backyard exercise-type evaluation before USMC transition begins; identify any issues requiring resolution
    - **Conduct post-transition evaluation on operational event selected by HQMC C4**



# Alternative C: Perform both Pre- & Post-transition Operational Evaluations

- Pros
  - More issues identified and processes tested than through either evaluation alone
  - Significantly higher degree of confidence in deployables concept achieved
    - Dual test strategy will produce more realistic evaluation scenario in terms of ISF involvement (i.e. first test will receive significantly greater ISF attention than any real deployment; second test will reflect more normal ISF support)
- Cons
  - Costs will be commensurately higher
  - Greater impact to fleet units (i.e. more units involved with testing)



# Proposed Evaluation Strategy

- Phase III: Ongoing Configuration Management Testing
  - Coordination between ISF and DON in the config mgmt process may result in ongoing need for lab testing
    - Need to maintain CM between DON systems and current NMCI load
      - Software updates/patches, hardware upgrades, etc will require some testing to ensure compatibility with NMCI
      - Gold Disk updates may affect DON systems



# Roles & Responsibilities

- HQMC C4
  - Approve Deployables Testing Strategy; select units & training exercises for test scenarios
- MCOTEA
  - Develop USMC Deployables Evaluation Plan
    - Pre- & Post-Transition phases
  - Select TEEP event, coordinate evaluation with unit
- PM NMCI
  - Coordinate all programmatic aspects of evaluation
- MCTSSA
  - Dedicate time, personnel and lab resources for deployable seats evaluation



# Roles & Responsibilities

- MITNOC
  - Help develop/review Deployables Evaluation Plan(s)
  - Participate in ongoing deployables CM testing activities
- Systems Engineering & Integration (SE&I)
  - Coordinate SIE taskings with PM NMCI
- USMC Deployables Working Group
  - Provide fleet input & review of deployables testing procedures
- ISF
  - Assist DON in acquiring CLIN 4ACs for testing
  - Assist in development of lab testing procedures
  - Provide Tiger Team assistance during operational unit evaluation(s)



# Schedule

- Lab Evaluation could begin as soon as:
  - Resources are identified to fund work by MCTSSA
  - SIE configured for deployable seat evaluation; personnel available
  - NMCI Deployable seats obtained from ISF (ordered/loaned)
  - Deployables evaluation procedures developed
- Target date: Begin Lab Evaluation in June 02





# Schedule

- USMC Operational Unit Evaluation
  - Pre-transition evaluation target date: 01 Nov 02
  - Post-transition evaluation target date: 30-60 days following cutover of MCB Quantico (Jan-Mar 03)



# Decision Points

- Deployables Testing: Is C4 Going to Base Buying Decision on Test Results?
  - If so, Need decision on testing approach:
  - Lab testing by MCTSSA: Go/No-Go
  - Pre-transition “OA” by MCOTEA: Go/No-Go
    - If Go: Need to select Unit, Training event
  - Post-transition OT by MCOTEA: Select Unit & Training Exercise/Deployment (MCTEEP)



# Decision Points

- Overall Deployables Issues
  - Signature on DSP final version (v3.04) (Gen Shea)
  - Funding for additional primary hard drives/NASs
  - Tactical Application Reachback Testing; “MI” section participation(?)



# Backup Slides



# Schedule Events



- Schedule (continued)
  - Develop SOW for lab evaluation activities - 18 Mar 02
  - Develop first draft of USMC Appendix to DSP - 15 Mar 02
  - Identify total funding required for deployables evaluation - 28 Mar 02 (based on further guidance to MCOTEA)  
(MCOTEA - OT&E costs; MCTSSA - SIE Lab evaluation costs)
  - Develop deployables lab evaluation plan - 15 Apr 02
  - Obtain CLIN 4AC seats from ISF for lab evaluation - 01 May 02
  - Lab facilities ready for deployables evaluation - 21 May 02  
(ready = lab staffed and configured for seats)
  - Deployables Lab Evaluation: 01 June 02
  - OT&E test plan complete - 01 September 02
  - OT&E: Apr 03